

REMARKS

Claims 1, 9-13, 18, 19, 32 and 33 are pending in the present patent application. Claims 1, 9-13, 18, 19, 32 and 33 stand rejected. This application continues to include claims 1, 9-13, 18, 19, 32 and 33.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering Applicants' previous arguments, and for withdrawing the previous rejection of claims 1, 9-13, 18, 19, 32 and 33.

Claims 1, 9-13, 18, 19, 32 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Morrow, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0038177 A1 (hereinafter, Morrow) in view of Hamdi, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,408,351 B1 (hereinafter, Hamdi). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 9-13, 18, 19, 32 and 33 in view of the following.

Morrow is directed to enhanced PC Card controllers and media bay systems which support multiple flash media types, and to flash media adapters which enable support for multiple flash media types (paragraph 0002). A multimedia passive adapter 40 interacts with an enhanced PC card controller 34 to communicate card detection information as well as flash media type, such that the enhanced PC card controller 34 determines, i.e. senses, the presence of one or more installed flash media 20, and determines the type of connected flash media 20 (paragraph 0039).

Hamdi is directed to a peripheral coder/decoder (codec) that has low power consumption such that the peripheral codec facilitates bus-powered peripheral devices that utilize a codec, such as a modem (col. 1, lines 40-43). Hamdi discloses that USB hubs provide attachment points to the USB, and that a hub controller provides the interface registers that allow communication to/from the host (col. 3, line 41 to col. 4, line 4). A host-based modem is implemented by a microprocessor 108 in the computer 102 (host computer) and a modem codec board 104, and the

host-based modem includes a peripheral USB bus so that the microprocessor 108 and the modem codec board 104 can interact, wherein the peripheral bus provides not only a data path but also a power source to the modem codec board 104 (col. 13, lines 31-40). The modem codec board 104 could also be connected to a USB hub (col. 13, lines 41-44).

Applicants believe that claims 1, 9-13, 18, 19, 32 and 33 patentably define Applicants' invention over Morrow and Hamdi, taken alone or in combination, for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1 is directed to a computer network.

Claim 1 recites, in part, a microprocessorless network adapter interconnecting said at least one host computer and said at least one peripheral device.

Morrow and Hamdi, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest a microprocessorless network adapter interconnecting the at least one host computer and the at least one peripheral device, as recited in claim 1.

For example, Hamdi does not disclose, teach, or suggest a microprocessorless network adapter interconnecting the at least one host computer and the at least one peripheral device, as recited in claim 1, nor is so asserted. Rather, Morrow is relied on for the above-mentioned subject matter of claim 1.

In particular, it is asserted that Morrow discloses that adapter 40 is a microprocessorless network adapter. However, adapter 40 is not a network adapter. Rather, adapter 40 is a multimedia passive adapter, which does not disclose, teach, or suggest a network adapter.

For example, Morrow discloses that multimedia passive adapter 40 interacts with the enhanced PC Card controller 34, to communicate card detection information as well as flash media type, such that the enhanced PC card controller 34 determines, i.e. senses, the presence of

2001-0553.01/LII0303.US 8

one or more installed flash media 20, and determines the type of connected flash media 20 (paragraph 0039).

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that it is clear that the Morrow adapter 40 is not a network adapter, but rather, is a flash media card adapter for reading information from flash media, which is wholly unrelated to, and does not in any manner disclose, teach, or suggest a network adapter.

In addition, it is asserted that Morrow reference character 20 pertains to a peripheral. However, Morrow discloses that reference character 20 is a flash media 20, which is a removable memory, and is not a “peripheral device” as that term is ordinarily used in the art.

Accordingly Morrow does not disclose, teach, or suggest a microprocessorless network adapter interconnecting the at least one host computer and the at least one peripheral device, as recited in claim 1.

In addition, although it is asserted that Hamdi discloses a USB hub interconnecting at least one peripheral device and a microprocessorless network adapter, Applicants respectfully submit that Hamdi discloses a host-based modem that is implemented by a microprocessor 108 in the computer 102 (host computer) and a modem codec board 104, and the host-based modem includes a peripheral USB bus so that the microprocessor 108 and the modem codec board 104 can interact, wherein the peripheral bus provides not only a data path but also a power source to the modem codec board 104 (col. 13, lines 31-40). The modem codec board 104 could also be connected to a USB hub (col. 13, lines 41-44).

Thus, Hamdi discloses a modem operated by microprocessor 108, which is thus not a microprocessorless network adapter, but rather, a host-operated microprocessor-based modem.

In addition, Hamdi discloses that the modem codec board 104 is coupled directly to the computer 102 via the USB bus 106 or via a USB hub that may also connect other peripheral devices.

Accordingly, Hamdi discloses a computer 102 that may connect to a microprocessor-based modem's codec board 104 via a USB hub, and may also connect to a peripheral via the USB hub, which does not in any manner disclose, teach, or suggest a microprocessorless network adapter interconnecting at least one host computer and at least one peripheral device; and a USB hub interconnecting the at least one peripheral device and a microprocessorless network adapter.

For example, with Applicants' invention of claim 1, the peripheral device is connected to the microprocessorless network adapter via the USB hub, and the microprocessorless network adapter connects the host computer to the peripheral device, which is thus connected to the host computer via both the microprocessorless network adapter and also via the USB hub, which Hamdi clearly does not do.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Morrow and Hamdi, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of claim 1, and even if combined, would not yield the subject matter of claim 1.

Claim 1 is thus believed allowable in its present form.

Claim 9 is directed to a computer network, and recites, in part, a microprocessorless network adapter interconnecting said at least one host computer and said at least one peripheral device.

Morrow and Hamdi, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest a microprocessorless network adapter interconnecting the at least one host computer and the at least one peripheral device for substantially the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 9 also recites wherein said microprocessorless network adapter is configured to manage power on said at least one peripheral device.

Morrow does not disclose, teach, or suggest wherein a microprocessorless network adapter is configured to manage power on at least one peripheral device, nor is it so asserted. Rather, Hamdi is relied on.

In particular, the Hamdi abstract and the Hamdi passages at column 1, lines 5-17 and column 13, lines 38-41 are relied on.

However, in contrast to a microprocessorless network adapter is configured to manage power on at least one peripheral device, Hamdi discloses a bus powered peripheral device (abstract and column 1, lines 5-17), and that a peripheral bus provides a power source to a modem codec board (column 13, lines 38-41).

Thus, Hamdi merely discloses that a peripheral device may be powered by a bus, which does not in any manner imply or otherwise disclose, teach, or suggest managing power, much less wherein a microprocessorless network adapter is configured to manage power on the at least one peripheral device. For example, Hamdi does not in any manner disclose, teach, or suggest that the modem/ modem codec board 104 manages power on a peripheral device.

Further, the Hamdi modem/modem codec board 104 is disclosed as being powered by a bus, which is essentially opposite in concept to that of a microprocessorless network adapter is configured to manage power on the at least one peripheral device.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Morrow and Hamdi, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of claim 9, and even if combined, would not yield the subject matter of claim 9.

Claim 10 is directed to a computer network, and recites, in part, a microprocessorless network adapter interconnecting said at least one host computer and said at least one peripheral device.

Morrow and Hamdi, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest a microprocessorless network adapter interconnecting said at least one host computer and said at least one peripheral device, as recited in claim 10, for substantially the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 10 also recites, in part, wherein said microprocessorless network adapter is configured to send said at least one peripheral device at least one command to go into a low-power sleep mode until said microprocessorless network adapter detects inbound data bound for said at least one peripheral device.

Morrow does not disclose, teach, or suggest the above mentioned subject matter of claim 10, nor is it so asserted. Rather, Hamdi is relied on, in particular, at column 14, lines 62-65 and column 17, lines 5-16.

However, the relied upon Hamdi passages pertain to a power manager 214 of a bus interface 200 that manages power on the modem codec board 104 for compliance with the USB specification.

Thus, the relied-upon Hamdi passages disclose that the asserted microprocessorless network adapter, which is the modem codec board 104, has its power managed by power manager 214, which is essentially opposite in concept to that of a microprocessorless network configured to send said at least one peripheral device at least one command to go into a low-power sleep mode until said microprocessorless network adapter detects inbound data bound for said at least one peripheral device.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Morrow and Hamdi, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of claim 10, and even if combined, would not yield the subject matter of claim 10.

Claim 11 is directed to a computer network, and recites, in part, a microprocessorless network adapter interconnecting said at least one host computer and said at least one peripheral device.

Applicants respectfully submit that Morrow and Hamdi, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest a microprocessorless network adapter interconnecting at least one host computer and at least one peripheral device, as recited in claim 11, for substantially the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 11 also recites, in part, wherein said microprocessorless network adapter is configured to at least one of send a wake-up command to said at least one peripheral device and verify an active status of said at least one peripheral device before accepting the inbound data.

Applicants respectfully submit that Morrow and Hamdi, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest wherein said microprocessorless network adapter is configured to at least one of send a wake-up command to said at least one peripheral device and verify an active status of said at least one peripheral device before accepting the inbound data, as recited in claim 11, for substantially the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 10.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Morrow and Hamdi, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of claim 11, and even if combined, would not yield the subject matter of claim 11.

Claim 12 is directed to a computer network, and recites, in part, a microprocessorless network adapter interconnecting said at least one host computer and said at least one peripheral device.

Applicants respectfully submit that Morrow and Hamdi, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest a microprocessorless network adapter interconnecting at least one host computer and at least one peripheral device, as recited in claim 12, for substantially the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 12 also recites, in part, wherein said microprocessorless network adapter is configured to perform automatic USB enumeration.

Morrow does not disclose, teach, or suggest the above mentioned subject matter of claim 12, nor is it so asserted. Rather, Hamdi is relied on, in particular, at column 6, lines 1-6.

However, the relied upon Hamdi passages merely discuss enumerating the USB bus in general terms, and do not in any manner disclose, teach, or suggest that the asserted network adapter is configured to perform automatic USB enumeration.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Morrow and Hamdi, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of claim 12, and even if combined, would not yield the subject matter of claim 12.

Claim 13 is believed allowable due to its dependence on otherwise allowable base claim 12. In addition, claim 13 further and patentably defines the invention over Morrow and Hamdi, taken alone or in combination.

Claim 18 is directed to a network adapter, and recites at least one application specific integrated circuit; and support electronics, wherein said network adapter is microprocessorless;

and wherein said application specific integrated circuit is configured to perform automatic USB enumeration.

Claim 18 is believed allowable in its present form for substantially the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 12, since Morrow and Hamdi, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest a microprocessorless network adapter, and do not disclose, teach, or suggest wherein an integrated circuit of the microprocessorless network adapter is configured to perform automatic USB enumeration.

Claim 19 is believed allowable due to its dependence on otherwise allowable base claim 18. In addition, claim 19 further and patentably defines the invention over Morrow and Hamdi, taken alone or in combination.

Claim 32 is directed to a computer network, and recites, in part, a microprocessorless network adapter interconnecting said at least one host computer and said at least one peripheral device.

Morrow and Hamdi, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest a microprocessorless network adapter interconnecting at least one host computer and at least one peripheral device, as recited in claim 32, for substantially the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 32 also recites, in part, wherein said microprocessorless network adapter is configured to provide power to said at least one peripheral device.

Morrow and Hamdi, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest wherein a microprocessorless network adapter is configured to provide power to at least one peripheral device, as recited in claim 32, for substantially the same reasons as set forth above with

respect to claim 9. For example, Hamdi discloses that the modem codec card 104 is powered by a bus (column 13, lines 38-41), not the other way around.

Claim 33 is directed to a network adapter, and recites at least one application specific integrated circuit; and support electronics, wherein said network adapter is microprocessorless; and wherein said network adapter is configured to provide power to at least one peripheral device.

Claim 33 is believed allowable in its present form for substantially the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1, since Morrow and Hamdi, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest a microprocessorless network adapter.

In addition, for substantially the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claims 9 and 10, Hamdi discloses that the asserted microprocessorless network adapter, which is the modem codec board 104, has its power provided by a bus (column 13, lines 38-41), which is essentially opposite to a microprocessorless network configured to provide power to at least one peripheral device, as recited in claim 33.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that no combination of the cited references teaches, discloses or suggests the subject matter of the appended claims, and that the appended claims are directed to statutory subject matter. The appended claims are therefore in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of all rejections and allowance of the claims.

In the event Applicants have overlooked the need for an extension of time, an additional extension of time, payment of fee, or additional payment of fee, Applicants hereby conditionally petition therefor and authorize that any charges be made to Deposit Account No. 20-0095, TAYLOR & AUST, P.C.

Should any question concerning any of the foregoing arise, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (317) 894-0801.

Respectfully submitted,

/Paul C. Gosnell/

Paul C. Gosnell
Registration No. 46,735

Attorney for Applicants

RKA14/ts

TAYLOR & AUST, P.C.
12029 E. Washington Street
Indianapolis, IN 46229
Telephone: 317-894-0801
Facsimile: 317-894-0803

Electronically Filed: October 23, 2007